



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND
DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, DC 20231
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

FEB 11 2003

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800

Withrow & Terranova, PLLC
P.O.Box 1287
Cary, NC 27512

In re Application of
David D. Hadden et al.
Application No. 09/837,076
Filed: April 18, 2001
For: PERFORMANCE-BASED TRAINING
ASSESSMENT

DECISION ON PETITION
TO WITHDRAW THE
HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

This is a decision on the applicant's renewed petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment, filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), on October 16, 2002. The delay in treating this petition is sincerely regretted.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

A review of the file record indicates that the application was held abandoned for failure to respond to the Office action mailed February 12, 2002.

There is a strong presumption that Office communication properly addressed and delivered to the United States Postal Services, was in fact delivered to the addressee. An allegation that the Office communication was not received must be overcome by a showing that it was not received.

The showing required to establish non-receipt of an Office communication must include all of the following requirements:

- (1) A statement from the practitioner stating the Office communication was not received by the practitioner;
- (2) A statement attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received; and
- (3) A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement.

The docket records indicated above must include a copy of the list of all responses in the practitioner's office with the due date of May 12, 2002. See Notice entitled "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received," 1156 O.G.53 (November 16, 1993).

Applicant's petition submits a statement that the applicant did not receive the above-noted Office action. Applicant also attests to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office action would have been entered as being due was also submitted. This evidence is acceptable proof of non-receipt as provided by 1156 OG 53.

The application is being forwarded to the Supervisory Legal Instruments Examiner with instructions withdraw the abandonment, return the application to pending status and to redate and remail the Office action of February 12, 2002 based on the reasoning in the case of *Delgar v. Schuyler*, 172 USPQ 513.

Telephone inquiries relative to this decision should be directed to me at the number below.



Steven N. Meyers, Special Program Examiner
Patent Technology Center 3600
(703) 308-3868
Facsimile No.: (703) 605-0586

SM: 2/6/03